



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/910,115

08/13/97

BAYCHAR

BAY-310

FAY SHARPE BEALL FAGAN
MINNICH & MCKEE
104 EAST HUME AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA VA 22301

IM62/0524

EXAMINER

JUSKA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED:

05/24/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/910,115

Applicant

Baychar

Examiner
Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit
1771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 29, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendment C, submitted as Paper No. 11 on February 29, 2000, has been entered. The specification has been amended as requested. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, and 20 have been amended. The pending claims are 1-24.
2. Applicant's traversal of the objection to the oath/declaration, as set forth in section 2 of the last Office Action, has been found persuasive. Thus, said objection is hereby withdrawn. Amendment C is sufficient to withdraw the objection to the specification, as set forth in section 3(a) of the last Office Action. Additionally, Amendment C is sufficient to withdraw the double patenting rejection, set forth in section 4 of the last Office Action. The claim objections, set forth in section 5 of the last Office Action, and the 35 USC 101 rejections, set forth in section 7 of the last Office Action, are hereby withdrawn due to Amendment C. The 112, 1st rejection set forth in section 9 of the last Office Action, is hereby withdrawn due to Applicant's persuasive arguments. The 112, 2nd rejections of claims 1 and 8, as set forth in section 12 of the last Office Action, are also hereby withdrawn due to Amendment C. Furthermore, the prior art rejections set forth in sections 15 and 16 of the last Office Action, are hereby withdrawn due to Amendment C, which adds a limitation of a nonwoven layer to independent claim 8.

Art Unit: 1771

Specification

3. The use of the trademarks have been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Said rejection is maintained from the last Office Action, section 3(b). Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 14, 15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 14, 15, 18, and 19 depend ultimately from independent claim 8, which now includes a limitation to a nonwoven layer. Thus, it is unclear if the nonwoven recited in claims 14, 15, 18, and 19 is in addition to, or the same, as the nonwoven of claim 8.

7. Similarly, claim 17, which depends from claim 16, is indefinite because it is unclear if the claimed nonwoven is in addition to, or the same, as that recited in claim 16.

Art Unit: 1771

8. Claim 20 is indefinite for the use of the phrase “selected from a group of outer moisture transfer materials” (lines 5-6 of said claim) without setting forth said group. Said rejection is maintained from the last Office Action, section 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-4, 8-10, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,338,366 issued to Evans et al.

Independent claim 1 is drawn to a multilayered fabric comprised of a first layer of a first moisture transfer material, a second layer of a foam material, a third layer of a breathable membrane, and a fourth layer of a second outer moisture transfer material. Independent claim 8 is drawn to a multilayered fabric comprised of a first layer of a first moisture transfer material, a second layer of a foam material attached to a nonwoven material, and a third layer of a second outer moisture transfer material.

Evans discloses a multilayered fabric for use as a wiping implement comprised of an absorbent core sandwiched between two wicking layers (abstract). Suitable materials for the absorbent core include foams (col. 4, lines 27-30). The outer wicking layers are comprised of

Art Unit: 1771

cloth-like webs which promote rapid transport of drops of liquid (col. 4, lines 37-40 and col. 5, lines 18-25). Additionally, Evans teaches intermediate layers may be present between the absorbent core and the outer wicking layers. Specifically, Figure 5 shows an intermediate layer of a meltblown nonwoven material attached to a foam absorbent core (col. 10, line 58-col. 11, line 5).

Thus, it can be seen that the invention of Evans anticipates Applicant's claim 8. Additionally, it is asserted that the Evans disclosure anticipates claim 1, in that the meltblown nonwoven material of Evans can be broadly interpreted as a "breathable membrane."

With regard to Applicant's recitation that the inventive multilayered fabric is an "apparel to be worn by an individual," it is noted that said recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

With regard to claims 2-4, 9, and 10, it is argued that said claims contain process limitations within an article claim. As such, and in the absence of a showing of the criticality of said process limitations to the claimed article, said limitations are hereby not given patentable

Art Unit: 1771

weight. In other words, the method of attaching the layers of fabric to each other (i.e., lamination or mechanical bonding) is irrelevant to the structure of the article as claimed.

With regard to claims 14-19, which basically all limit the foam (an elastomeric layer) to a nonwoven layer, it is asserted that the cited Evans patent clearly teaches this embodiment.

Therefore, claims 1-4, 8-10, and 14-19 are rejected by the cited Evans patent.

11. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12, and 14-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,338,371 issued to Dawn et al.

Claims 6 and 12 limit the outer moisture layers to be coated by a waterproof film.

Dawn discloses an absorbent product comprised of (a) a facing layer 12, which is water pervious, (b) a wicking layer 14, which transports moisture away from the facing layer to an absorbent core, (c) a foam layer (32 and 34) and a highly water permeable nonwoven layer (22) as part of an absorbent core, (d) a second water pervious layer (24) which may be of the same material as 14, and (e) a water impervious backing layer 30, which may be a woven fabric coated with a film (col. 3, lines 15-40; col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 5; col. 5, lines 1-13; col. 5, lines 21-22; and Figures 1 and 2).

The same arguments presented above with regard to the preamble recitation, methods limitations of claims 2-4, 9, and 10, and the nonwovens of claims 14-19, are applicable here. Thus, it can be seen that the cited Dawn patent anticipates Applicant's claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12, and 14-19.

Art Unit: 1771

12. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,637,389 issued to Colvin et al.

Claim 20 is drawn to a two-layer structure comprising a first layer of a moisture transfer material and a second layer of a moisture transfer layer which has been treated with encapsulation.

Colvin discloses a microencapsulated foam material (abstract). In one embodiment, a two-layer structure is formed, wherein only one layer is encapsulated (Figure 4 and col. 5, lines 63-65). Additionally, Colvin teaches that the foam material may be hydrophilic, wherein moisture is absorbed and released (col. 7, lines 30-37). Hence, it can be seen that the cited Colvin patent anticipates Applicant's claim 20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Dawn patent in view of US Patent 5,269,862 issued to Nakajima et al.

Said claims limit the outer layer to be a fabric structurally knitted or woven to repel water. Although Dawn is silent with regard to said limitation, said fabrics are well-known in the art, as is evidenced by the cited Nakajima patent (abstract; col. 2, lines 5-9 and 18-22). Thus, it would

Art Unit: 1771

have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute a waterproof coated fabric, as is taught by Dawn, with a fabric specifically constructed to be waterproof, as is disclosed by Nakajima.

Motivation to do so would be the inherent advantages of the Nakajima fabric, such as high fashionability, high air permeability, and waterproofness. Therefore, claims 7 and 13 are rejected as being obvious over the cited patents.

15. Claims 5, 11, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Evans and/or Dawn patents in view of the cited Colvin patent.

Said claims limit a layer to be treated with microencapsulation. Although the cited Evans and Dawn patents do not teach of a microencapsulation treatment, said treatment is well-known in the art. For example, Colvin teaches the treatment of a substrate with microencapsulation renders said substrate to act as a thermal insulator. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to treat a layer of the inventions of Evans or Dawn with microencapsulation in order to render said layer as a thermal insulator. Upon said treatment, the inventions of Evans and Dawn could be expanded to other applications, such as a wiping implement for extreme temperature surfaces. Therefore, said claims are rejected as being obvious over the cited art.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is (703) 305-4472. If attempts to

Art Unit: 1771

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached at (703) 308-2414. Fax numbers for this Group are (703) 305-3601 and (703) 305-7718.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cheryl Juska', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

CHERYL JUSKA
PATENT EXAMINER

cj

May 22, 2000